

and a good bit of the shell of each gone also. We distinctly noticed on them the marks of the front teeth of a squirrel; and as the wood was full of the common species, concluded that it was the work of *Sciurus cinereopectus*, J. E. Gray. The note of this Owl may be heard for a great part of the night in its breeding-localities. It consists of a long *cóu*, uttered loudly and with stress. *Ephialtes glabripes* was described in the Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. 1870, vol. vi. p. 152.

XXXII.—*A Reply to Mr. Allan Hume's Review* of 'Die Papageien' of Dr. Otto Finsch.* By ARTHUR, Viscount WALDEN, M.B.O.U.

DR. FINSCH published the first volume of his famous monograph of the Psittacidae in 1867; the second volume in 1868. Mr. Hume has (*l. c.*) reviewed the work in 1874. It is of the highest importance that the reader of the Review and of the following remarks should constantly bear the last two dates in his memory. But the reader will be disappointed if, misled by the full title of Mr. Hume's review, "Die Papageien," he expects a comprehensive account of the entire work. For, though the footfall of Mr. Hume is not usually deterred by angelic fears, in this critique of a complete work on the Parrots of the world he has only favoured us with the benefit of his views on Dr. Finsch's treatment of eleven species, belonging to a single genus, *Palæornis*. Truly but a small portion of Dr. Finsch's exhaustive monograph of the Order! Mr. Hume's critical remarks, though thus narrowed, cannot be described as either strictly complimentary or enucleate. He assures us his "relations" with Dr. Finsch "have always been most friendly" (*t. c.* p. 28); but his first impulse, after grudging the postage on a second copy, was "to throw the book into the fire" (*t. c.* p. 4); and in this dignified frame of mind he proceeds, by a pitiless bespattering of Dr. Finsch, to still further cement their "friendly relations." Besides many smaller, two serious charges are brought against Dr. Finsch. He is

* Stray Feathers, ii. pp. 1-28 (1874).

accused of treating Jerdon, Blyth, and all Indian ornithologists generally with slighting discourtesy; and, secondly, of displaying a wanton and perverse ignorance of the species he has written upon—"error too, entirely gratuitous" (*t. c. p. 1*). It is proposed in the following remarks to examine into these accusations and to ascertain whether, considering their gravity when brought against a scientific man, they rest upon any more solid foundation than Mr. Hume's assertions. With this object in view each species known in the skin by Mr. Hume will be treated separately and in its order, while the remarks of Mr. Hume on the remaining species of the genus, unknown to him, will be left unnoticed. Some preliminary and lesser (speaking comparatively) attacks on Dr. Finsch deserve a cursory review, and may conveniently be at once referred to.

Before entering into details, Mr. Hume records his "humble protest against the presumptuous . . . systematic pedantry which characterizes a certain section (chiefly continental) of naturalists, and leads them to discard the names given, too often by better men than themselves, . . . for new-fangled appellations of their own, because, forsooth, their vast classical attainments have enabled them to discover that the original name is not a '*classich* gebildetes wort*' †. Dr. Finsch is a hardened offender in this respect, and cannot possibly be recommended to mercy" (*t. c. p. 2*). And Dr. Finsch is then fallen upon for his alterations of the specific titles *schisticeps*, *Hodgs.*, and "Jerdon's ‡ *columboides*," to *hodgsoni* and *peristerodes*. "Let us," Mr. Hume exclaims with an inimitable humour, "Let us treat our author as he treats other people's species. '*Finsch*' §! contrary to all rules of orthography! what is that '*s*' doing there? '*Finch*'! Dr. *Fringilla*, МИН! Classich || gebildetes wort ¶!!" (*l. c.*). Nor is this dull drollery permitted to expire. For, once and again, in sentences such as "now to return to Dr. *Fringilla*, I mean Finsch" (*t. c. p. 4*),

* Corrected in *errata*.

† *Sic.*

‡ *Sic.*

§ All words in italics throughout this paper, other than titles of species, are so printed by Mr. Hume.

|| Corrected in *errata*.

¶ *Sic.*

and "regardless of the whole family of *Fringillidæ*" (*t. c.* p. 20), its ghastly echos grate on the tortured senses. It is not desired to be too hard on these feeble witicisms, nascent genius deserves encouragement, and their transcription to the pages of 'The Ibis' is a penalty sufficiently severe. Moreover it may be assured that if indulgence in such dreary buffoonery amuses Mr. Hume, or assists in promoting in India, if not the credit, at least the sale, of his periodical, Dr. Finsch will not grudge him the gratification. But deserving of passing notice is the fact that even when elaborating a joke, Mr. Hume cannot avoid being linguistically inaccurate. The German proper name 'Finsch' and the English substantive 'finch' are not synonymous.

In his concluding page (*t. c.* 28) Mr. Hume asks, "Pray Dr. Finsch how can it advance our real objects one atom, to call a bird that every one recognizes as 'columboides' by your *truly* classical name 'peristerodes'?" Without presuming to divine what Mr. Hume's "real objects" may be, the simple answer is that *peristerodes* is right and *columboides* is wrong. Let the literal meaning of the word *columboides* be expressed by a combination of English and French, or of English and German words, instead of Latin and Greek, and the grotesque incongruity will become apparent. Thus, Pigeonsemblable, or Pigeonähnlich, parrakeet. But from a writer who, when reviewing the masterly scientific work of a highly educated gentleman, descends to the use of slang terms and repellent vulgarisms, it may be too much to expect any appreciative sympathy with the modes of expression of a refined and cultured intellect.

This assumption is not weakened by the passage now to be quoted, containing the reply of "an unsophisticated field-naturalist here" to the question put by Mr. Hume of "what he thought of these Continental naturalists, with their eternal new names, and the everlasting '*mihi*' tagged on after them." " 'Well' he said 'I guess the beggars can't discover any new species of their own, so they have dodged up this classical jim, to legalize their stealing other people's'" (*t. c.* p. 2). May it be asked, not from motives of mere curiosity, but for

the information of ("the beggars"), the benighted naturalists of Europe, whether this is the style in which Indian field naturalists converse, or, at the least, those with whom Mr. Hume associates? or are we to take it as being only a sample of that language of the future "100 years hence, when English is spoken, as it then will be, by 500 millions of people"? (t. c. p. 4).

Not content with next gracefully indicating in these choice lines,

"Him as prigs vot isn't his'n,
Ven he's cotched 'ill go to pris'n,"

the proper abode of Dr. Finsch, Mr. Hume further threatens him, and authors like him, with the pillory—"and if the learned authors escape the pillory they so richly deserve (and it shall be no fault of mine if they do), at any rate we have the consolation of knowing, that posterity if it cannot 'quod' them 'will quod,' etc. (t. c. p. 3). There is something sublimely comical in this gentleman's threat to "pillory" those authors whose principles of nomenclature differ from his own. That Mr. Hume, single handed, is fully capable of providing an abundant supply of the appropriate missiles is not impossible. But who will assist in erecting the pillory?

There is also another form of pedantry which greatly exercises Mr. Hume; that "curious custom of parading brief descriptions in what is *supposed* to be Latin; as prefixes or tags to full, sound, sufficient English or German ones" (t. c. p. 3). "The motives that lead authors into this somewhat meaningless practice" (l. c.) are then analyzed, all that is ungenerous being attributed to them, while the self-evident reason escapes Mr. Hume's powers of conception. We are then assured, in solemn, prophetic tones and with a startling confidence, untempered by even a single, favourite, unctuous, saving adjuration of "D. V.," "that 100 years hence, when English is spoken, as it then will be, by 500 millions of people, any of their writings that survive, will do so only in expurgated editions from which all the 'Latin' has been carefully expunged" (t. c. p. 4). Then it is seriously suggested that Latin should be discarded and that all descriptions should be

written in either English, German, or French—it being overlooked that while naturalists of all nations might and do agree to employ Latin as a common medium of thought-exchange, it is most improbable that they would consent to forego using their own language and to adopt that of some rival nation. The Swedes, Norwegians, Danes, Russians, Dutch, Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, Spaniards, Portuguese, and Italians have all produced and are producing naturalists. Why are they to be condemned to write in English, French, or German? Would Mr. Hume consider it fair, when desirous of making known the discovery of a *Dissemuroides dicruriformis**(!), to be restricted to the use of the Czech, Russian, or Hungarian tongues? Is not Latin also that language in which descriptions can be rendered with the greatest precision and conciseness? M. Severtzoff's recent work, 'Turkestanskije Sevotnie,' is a case in point. It contains descriptions of many new species, and is entirely in Russian. It might be argued that M. Severtzoff should have written in English, French, or German. But perhaps M. Severtzoff may think that "100 years hence" Russian will be spoken by "500 millions of people" rather than English. Mr. Hume's proposal carries its own refutation.

Knowledge of the past and current literature implied, in natural history, by the term 'synonymy' meets with as little favour from Mr. Hume as every other branch of knowledge in which he is not a proficient. It is even doubtful, judging from his remarks, whether the meaning involved in the term is not somewhat beyond his grasp. A good synonymist, among other things, knows every description of a species, or, in other words, every species that has been described, and consequently the correct geographical range of each species. His statements of facts are therefore more likely to be accurate than those of the illiterate writer. If Mr. Hume were a synonymist he would have spared us many stale facts under the name of "novelties." Nor would he, for example, have recorded (*op. cit.* i. p. 378. no. 452) that a bird whose range is restricted to South China, *Ixus chrysorrhoides*, Lafr., occurs

* Hume, Str. Feath. i. p. 408.

in the centre of India. If the author of the excellent paper* in which this appears (*t. c.*) had only been allowed to follow Jerdon this blunder would have been avoided.

All through the Review there runs an endeavour to resuscitate fallacies, long since refuted and buried in Europe, concerning the superiority of one class of naturalists over another. Mr. Hume has noticed "a tendency on the part of the compilers of other men's observations to exalt themselves above the observers," etc. (*t. c.* p. 26) and a great deal more in the same imaginative strain, the outcome of but groundless though honest delusions. Can any one of my readers find among the past or daily writings of European naturalists a parallel to the exalted and vaniloquent self-assertion of this "humble student of many branches of Natural History" (*t. c.* p. 26)? Some stray sentiments contained in the concluding paragraphs of his Review are, though devoid of novelty, unimpeachable. But from the general drift of Mr. Hume's criticisms it is to be gathered that the men whose position, by choice or accident, enables them to live for a period of years in a country where certain animals are indigenous, and who, by means of their native collectors or by their own hands, are able to convert them into specimens from "the flesh," are immeasurably superior to the man who endeavours to evolve order out of chaos, and to marshal the disconnected often ill-digested and sometimes erroneous observations made by them. It is the old squabble between the belly and the members, and is certainly unworthy of discussion. But I venture to maintain that workers in the cause of any science are superior or inferior according to the amount of knowledge possessed by them of their special subject. To be a "trustworthy" field naturalist, who is after all only an observer of a single class of phenomena, he must have acquired, by long and assiduous study, all that has been recorded as observed by former naturalists. He must not only have a thorough knowledge of his own branch of natural history, but he must possess a more than general acquaintance with every other branch. By this means, and this only, will he know what to observe and how to ob-

* R. M. Adam, "Notes on the Birds of the Sambhur Lake."

serve. Knowing all that has been written, he will know what species have been described, what problems demand solution, and he will not bore the world with repetitions of well-known facts or records of trivial and useless observations. Another essential quality is that which gives the power of recording with precision and terseness, untainted by an inflated, sententious, and dogmatic egotism, the results of his observations. Such was Dr. Jerdon. If asked to illustrate my meaning by a living standard I would name Mr. Wallace as the highest.

"Let the cabinet naturalist stick to his synonyms . . . but let him avoid the presumption of disputing and denying the facts stated by admittedly trustworthy members of this latter class" (field workers) "because they happen to run counter to his own theories" (*t.c.* p. 27). It would be easy to point out the numberless erroneous observations made by field workers, Indian field workers to boot, even with the objects of their observations constantly before their eyes. And are naturalists in Europe (the most of whom, if not all, have been in their day, and are even now, field workers) to be charged with presumption when they "dispute" or "deny" such erroneous observations, or can show an absence of conclusive evidence? Why, the healthy progress of science depends on antagonism; it is by the flails of disputation that the truth is threshed out. But it is new to hear that a naturalist is open to imputations of presumption when he "disputes or denies" the accuracy of other men's observations. May we not, without being chargeable with flattery, venture to assume that Mr. Hume falls within his own definition of a trustworthy field naturalist; and yet was he not the discoverer, describer, and namer of *Niltava leucotis* (Ibis, 1870, p. 144)? An achievement almost vying in brilliancy with that of the discoverer of *Sparactes cristata*. Should a cabinet naturalist be debarred from disputing such an observation if he found it "ran counter to his own theories" of structure? In this instance cabinet naturalists were saved from the disagreeable duty; for I believe Mr. Hume subsequently suggested that he had described from a made-up specimen (Zool. Rec. vii. p. 50). But ornithologists generally owe a deep debt

of gratitude to Mr. Brooks for having first shown in detail, through the Editor of '*The Ibis*' (1871, p. 445, note), the real nature of this interesting species. Otherwise it might, for many years, if not for ever, have remained an object of hopeless longing to the Indian field ornithologist, and a perplexing puzzle to his less fortunate brethren the cabinet naturalists of the world. But as this useful information has been "paraded" only "in what is supposed to be Latin" and without a "full, sound, sufficient English or German" description, below is given* a translation for the benefit of the "500 millions of people" by whom "100 years hence" English will be spoken; and who will then only possess "expurgated editions" of '*The Ibis*,' if it "survives," and "from which all the 'Latin' has been carefully expunged."

As previously stated, one of the most serious accusations brought against Dr. Finsch is that of slighting discourtesy to Jerdon, Blyth, and other Indian naturalists. I have carefully read and reread the whole of Dr. Finsch's text, and have been unable to discover a passage that can, unless twisted, be fairly said to support the charge. "Dr. Finsch, a cabinet naturalist, on the strength, mainly, of some mis-sexed specimens in museums, takes on himself to disregard and disbelieve the positive statements of working field naturalists. Most pathetically does he lament our ignorance, (he should have spoken for himself, I think, not others!). He says (p. 26);" and then follows Dr. Finsch's general remarks commencing with, "Unfortunately we lack almost entirely a thorough observation of the Parrots" (Papag. i. p. 26)—remarks absolutely true when Dr. Finsch wrote, even if applied to the Indian Parrots, and still so of the greater part of the species to this day. Dr. Finsch in the passage quoted uses the word "Parrots" generally and in its widest sense. Mr. Hume, by restricting its meaning to the half dozen or so of species he has seen, dexterously turns Dr. Finsch's general remarks into

* "A manufactured bird, body of the *Rufous-bellied Fairy blue-chat*, head of the *Indian grey-tit*" (*Ibis*, l. c.). Dr. Finsch, although stigmatized a "pseudo-classicist" by Mr. Hume (*t. c.* p. 4), is doubtless competent to supply a "full, sound, sufficient German" description, if required.

a reflection on Jerdon. And yet Mr. Hume's tender and disinterested solicitude for Jerdon's reputation does not prevent him thus writing of Jerdon "that owing to his ill health in later years and his disregard for the literary side of his work" his "merits" "have been greatly underrated;" and further on "I admit that his book embodies many grave errors" (*t. c.* p. 5). His "merits underrated"! By whom, where? Not in Europe, surely not throughout India! "Disregard for the literary side of his work"! to be said of a man whose extraordinary acquaintance with the literature of his subject is displayed in all he wrote. Extraordinary in Jerdon, for in his day communication with Europe was infrequent and the land was not flooded, as now, with manuals and hand-books whereby the most shallow can attain with small exertion a smattering of facts sufficient to babble about under the name of science. "Grave errors"! It may be so. I have not detected them. But Mr. Hume says so. Dr. Finsch does not*. Mr. Blyth, with whose conclusions Dr. Finsch is not always in accord, was, while in India, essentially a cabinet naturalist. During the many years of his Indian sojourn he hardly quitted† the four walls of the museum his genius, knowledge, industry, and indomitable energy raised to the highest rank. Of the fourteen species of the genus *Palæornis* enumerated by Dr. Finsch he knew, previous to 1868, in the wild state, at the most only four—*P. torquatus*, *P. cyanocephalus* of Bengal, *P. eupatrius*, and *P. melanorhynchus*. As caged birds he may occasionally have seen two more—*P. schisticeps*, and perhaps *P. longicaudatus*.

Let us now take each of the species of the genus *Palæornis* in the sequence followed by Mr. Hume, and examine into the merits and justness of his criticisms. First comes *Palæornis eupatrius* (Linn.) = *P. alexandri* (Linn.) of Jerdon, Blyth, and the older Indian writers, subdivided by Mr. Hume in his Review, and for the first time, into three distinct species. Mr.

* No man, with so long a career, made fewer bad "species" than Dr. Jerdon, proof by itself of his knowledge of his subject.

† I believe he only made two excursions of any importance—one to the Midnapur jungles and, much later, on account of illness, one to Burma.

Hume's arguments in support of this subdivision have therefore no bearing on Dr. Finsch beyond this, that our German author followed both Blyth and Jerdon and nearly every other Indian naturalist when keeping the species united, while Mr. Hume differs from them. Captain Hutton last year, and also for the first time (Str. Feath. i. pp. 335, 338), had already subdivided one of Mr. Hume's three species into four distinct species; so that between these two Indian field naturalists the species, *P. eupatrius*, which Jerdon and Blyth had considered one and the same, is broken up into six species. "Dr. Finsch did not discriminate these three species and perhaps may not admit them now" (*t. c.* p. 11). Quite true. Unfortunately Dr. Finsch had followed Jerdon and Blyth, and had not foreseen in 1868 what Mr. Hume's great superiority of perception was going to discover in 1874. Mr. Hume then proceeds to quote the greater part of the passage in which Dr. Finsch states his reasons, in opposition to Jerdon and Blyth's recorded opinions, though stated with complete courtesy, for not feeling convinced that the sexes in *P. eupatrius* are distinguished by sexual peculiarities of plumage (Papag. ii. p. 14). After which Mr. Hume exclaims, "Please note the modesty and courtesy of this passage! Dr. Jerdon and Blyth (who have examined the fresh birds) state so and so, but Dr. Finsch thinks it is very probable that it is *quite* the contrary. Like the Psalmist of old, Dr. Finsch seems to have 'said in his heart that all men are liars'" (*l. c.*). There is not a word of discourtesy nor of dogmatism in the whole passage, though made to wear a semblance of egotism by Mr. Hume omitting, I will not say intentionally, to quote the concluding sentence. Here is the omitted final sentence with which the passage, as transcribed by Mr. Hume (*t. c.* p. 11), should be read. "Inasmuch as I must therefore in the meanwhile leave the question undecided, I commend it to the attention of all ornithologists (lege ich sie allen Ornithologen an's Herz)" (Papag. *l. c.*).

Jerdon and Blyth state that the large rose-ringed Parrakeets of Ceylon, the Andamans, and of the continent belong to one species. Mr. Hume states that they constitute three species. Mr. Hume may differ. Dr. Finsch may not. We then are

favoured with the information that Mr. Hume has "dissected at the *very least* fifty specimens of *P. sivalensis*" and that "Davison and I have recently sexed eighteen of *magnirostris*"*. And all that Mr. Oates and Captain Feilden and Messrs. Legge and G. Nevill have done and told Mr. Hume, that is, within the last year or two and with results unpublished until 1874, therefore has no bearing whatever on the conclusions arrived at by Dr. Finsch from the evidence existing previous to 1868.

And here let us pause to consider how is Dr. Finsch to deal with *P. eupatrius* when he is producing "a second and *most materially* revised edition" (*t. c.* p. 1), especially if Mr. Hume's hope of living to see it is likely to be realized. Captain Hutton, "our oldest Indian naturalist, who knew all about these Paroquets long before Dr. Finsch was born" (*t. c.* p. 14) and who "is quite a Paroquet fancier" (*t. c.* p. 12), says there are, and has named, four species on the Indian continent. Mr. Hume, "editor of the sole Indian ornithological journal," states that there is only one. Both are Indian field naturalists, who besides "contradicting†" Jerdon and Blyth, "contradict" one another. True, Dr. Finsch in his perplexity may point out that one species, *P. sacer*, Hutton (*Str. Feath. i.* p. 337), has never been seen by its discoverer, and that "the natives cannot distinguish" it from the common species; that another, *P. punjabi* [!], Hutton (*t. c.* p. 338), also "regarded by the natives as identical" (*l. c.*), chiefly differs by "sometimes sitting the whole day through without uttering any sound at all," its cry, however, when heard, differentiating the species by "being much more feeble and slightly croaking" (*l. c.*). While of *P. vindhiana*, Hutton (*l. c.*), its discoverer, describer, and denominator had "seen but one specimen and that was a half-fledged nestling brought to me for sale at Monghyr many years ago" (*l. c.*), and he has "failed to procure a specimen since" (*l. c.*). But of what avail these reasons when urged by a cabinet naturalist "on the strength of half a dozen

* Titles recently proposed for two of the fragments of *P. eupatrius*.

† The noble passage commencing "I contradict Dr. Finsch, and would contradict any one else," etc. (*t. c.* p. 8), and others, displaying almost equal beauties, a lack of space compels reluctant omission.

wrongly sexed skins in some museum, taking upon himself to contradict the definite statements of trustworthy field naturalists like those "I have "referred to, in regard to matters of which he can personally know nothing" (*t. c.* p. 2). Would it not appear "to indicate a tone of thought incompatible with the philosophical investigation of any branch of physical science" (*l. c.*)?

"What the young birds are like is unfortunately never said.' Well, let Dr. Finsch hear what Captain Hutton says" (*t. c.* p. 12). Dr. Finsch's remark was absolutely true when he published it, and the plumage and colouring of the young birds remained undescribed until 1873, when Captain Hutton first published his account (*t. c.* p. 336), to which Mr. Hume now refers Dr. Finsch in 1874, without, however, indicating the source or the date, and thereby leaving the reader to infer that Dr. Finsch ought to have known it.

Mr. Hume then notices a geographical error in this wise:— "As for what Dr. Finsch *can* prove, about *torquatus* and *cyanocephalus*, we shall see hereafter, in the mean time in regard to the present group of species, I would remark, that if Leith Adams really says he found any one of them common in the 'Forest districts of Ladakh,' I will not contradict him, *but* I can only say I have been all over Ladakh, twice*, without being so fortunate as to meet with any Forest district, and that I never myself met with the large rose-ringed Paroquet in Ladakh" (*t. c.* pp. 12, 13). What Dr. Finsch does really make Leith Adams say is "very common in all the forest districts of Cashmere and Ladakh" (Papag. ii. p. 15). This is taken from Mr. Adams's paper "The Birds of Cashmere and Ladakh" (P. Z. S. 1859, p. 169); and Dr. Finsch has inadvertently added the words "and Ladakh" to the phrase "wooded slopes of the lesser ranges southward of Cashmere." That Dr. Finsch was nodding at the time he made the quotation is true; but surely it was a very little nod and easily ex-

* Does not Mr. Hume here rather hide his light under a bushel? What, no further than Ladakh? The booksellers have recently enriched my library with a copy of a work entitled "Lahore to Yarkand, Henderson and Hume."

plained, and Mr. Hume ought to have given the quotation in full. In his account of the complete range of the species (*t. c.* pp. 14, 15) Dr. Finsch correctly excludes Ladakh while retaining Cashmere.

Mr. Hume then favours us with this criticism:—"Dr. Finsch says, that *eupatrius* never frequents gardens or towns, but I may mention that the last time (November 9th, 1867), I was up the minars of the Juma or Badishaiee Musjid at Lahore, a huge flock of *sivalensis* were wheeling and screaming round me," etc. (*t. c.* p. 13). Dr. Finsch's statement is nevertheless perfectly accurate and in accordance with the recorded observations of all Indian naturalists (*conf.* Blyth, J. A. S. B. 1850, p. 232, and Ibis, 1863, p. 3; and Jerdon, B. of Ind. i. p. 257). Anyhow, could Dr. Finsch possibly know, fully admitting the vast importance of the fact (only published in 1874), that Mr. Hume "the last time" he "was up the minars of the Juma or Badishaiee Musjid at Lahore," namely the 9th of November, 1867, had made this valuable observation? And had he known, could Dr. Finsch have stated it without risking the imputation of "pooh-poohing contemptuously the recorded experience of men like Jerdon and Blyth" (*t. c.* p. 2)? With a due feeling of awe, and under correction, I venture to surmise that, after all, the huge flock noticed by Mr. Hume when he last "was up the minars of the Juma," etc., was one of *P. torquatus*.

"Let us now turn to (4) *torquatus*" [*Palæornis torquatus* (Boddaert)], "and first hear what our learned Dr. has to say" (*t. c.* p. 13); and Mr. Hume transcribes the passage wherein Dr. Finsch endeavours to substantiate his theory that the sexes in the adult birds wear a similar dress. Dr. Finsch's reasoning is not convincing; but the argument is conducted with perfect propriety, and his data, such as they are, placed fully before the reader. But Mr. Hume, by means of a mistranslation of a German word used by Dr. Finsch, tries to fasten on him the charge of speaking slightly of Indian naturalists. "Dieser betrifft nämlich die angeblich grüne Färbung des ♀, wie sie von Blyth, Layard und Jerdon angegeben wird" (Papag. ii. p. 25). This sentence has been separately submitted to two

German gentlemen, and, without mentioning any reasons, they were asked to translate it. One is a gentleman of the highest scientific distinction, the other an independent gentleman of education, both understanding, writing, and speaking English perfectly. By both it was thus rendered: "This (point), namely, relates to the alleged (angeblich) green coloration of the female as stated by Blyth, etc." By Mr. Hume the German word "angeblich" is translated "pretended;" and having laid, through this misrendering of its true meaning, the foundation of a charge of discourtesy against Dr. Finsch, he observes half a page further on: "Here then are Dr. Finsch's strong proofs; proofs which in his opinion justify his speaking of what Jerdon, Layard, Blyth, Hutton, and a dozen other Indian naturalists have stated as facts, the result of their personal observations, as '*pretences*'" (*t. c.* p. 14). I am also assured by my two German friends that there is neither in the sentence quoted, nor throughout Dr. Finsch's argument, a trace of discourtesy to any one, and that by no fair construction, more especially when judged by the context, can the word "angeblich" be here rendered by the English verb "pretend" in its offensive sense. It will also be observed that Captain Hutton's name, not to mention the "dozen other Indian naturalists," is introduced by Mr. Hume, although not alluded to by Dr. Finsch, and moreover although Mr. Hume must have been well aware that Captain Hutton had never published any remarks on Parrots previous to 1873 that could reasonably be known to Dr. Finsch*. Mr. Hume having, by this skilful introduction of the offensive word "*pretences*," created in the superficial reader a prejudice against Dr. Finsch, proceeds, with many italicized words and outbursts of infallibility, to discuss Dr. Finsch's "proofs," and then continues, "Nothing, we are again informed, is said of the young. Well let our oldest Indian naturalist, who knew all about these Paroquets long before Dr. Finsch was born, enlighten him" (*t. c.* p. 14). Captain Hutton's description

* As a matter of fact I believe there were no published remarks on the subject by Captain Hutton extant when Dr. Finsch wrote, much less by a "dozen other Indian naturalists."

of the young (Str. Feath. i. p. 339) is then quoted, the reference and date 1873 being omitted and the impression left on the reader's mind that something had been said of the young when Dr. Finsch wrote, and that somehow or other he ought to have known it.

Dr. Finsch, for his account of *Palæornis cyanocephalus* (Linn.), is next passed under the harrow. "Here, according to my views, Dr. Finsch has combined two distinct species. In the one, which I will call *purpureus*, Mull* (Dr. Finsch will set me† right, doubtless, about the synonymy)," etc.: then descriptions of the two species and their differentiating characters are fully given, wound up with "I do not entertain the smallest doubt that Dr. Finsch is in error in uniting these two forms" (*t. c.* pp. 15, 16). From this it might fairly be presumed that Dr. Finsch in or before 1868 had heard of there being two species, those alluded to by Mr. Hume, but had declined recognizing them as distinct. Nothing of the sort. Their existence was known to no one at the time; and Dr. Finsch adopted the published statements of Jerdon and Blyth, neither of whom then ever suspected that two closely allied geographical races were being confounded under one title. The fact was, however, first discovered by Mr. Gould, and first made known by Mr. Blyth in 1870. "*Palæornis rosa*. Some time ago Mr. Gould called my attention to two races confounded under this name, which are evidently distinct," etc. (Blyth, *Ibis*, 1870, p. 162). On Jerdon's return to England I showed to him skins of the two forms, and he at once admitted that they might fairly be considered as belonging to two species; and in 1872 (*Ibis*, (3) ii. p. 6) he published, in a supplementary note to the 'Birds of India,' his concurrence with Blyth's opinion. "My views" had therefore been long before held by Gould, Blyth, Jerdon, and other European naturalists; but they were first promulgated, and by Blyth, two years after the publishing date of 'Die Papageien.' The two supposed species of the late Mr.

* *Sic*.

† Or rather the late Mr. G. R. Gray (Hand-list, no. 8054), who in his turn got the title from Cassin (P. Ac. N. Sc. Philadelphia, 1864, p. 239).

Gray's list of the *Psittacidae* (1859, pp. 20, 21), *P. bengalensis* and *P. rosa*, were nothing but phases of the plumage of the Nipaul bird.

We next come upon another illustration of Mr. Hume's logical obliquity. "We are told that 'Alas! the Indian ornithologists give us no satisfactory answer to many of the most difficult questions. Jerdon only says, that the female has a blue head and that the young are green'" (*t. c.* p. 16). "Alas!" is Mr. Hume's rendering of the German word "leider," and, with the note of exclamation introduced by Mr. Hume, helps to give the passage an air of contemptuous pity which is not in the original German. It is therefore necessary to quote Dr. Finsch's own words:—"Leider geben uns die indischen Ornithologen über viele derartige schwierige Fragen nicht die gewünschte Auskunft" (Papag. ii. p. 47). "Unfortunately the Indian ornithologists do not give us the wished-for information on many of the difficult questions of that class" is a fair translation of the passage; and Dr. Finsch's observation, being strictly accurate when he wrote, can only be met by Mr. Hume as follows, for he cannot quote the writings of a single author previous to 1868:—"Does he want 'a full, true, and particular account' from one who has taken scores of *purpureus* from their nest-holes and reared them by dozens? Let Captain Hutton speak; his synonymy is faulty, he is no cabinet naturalist, but he knows the *birds* as well as he does his own children" (*t. c.* pp. 16, 17). And then, as usual, follows an extract from Captain Hutton's paper (*Str. Feath.* i. p. 344) published five years after the publication of Dr. Finsch's work, but without the date and reference now given being quoted. Indeed the information the absence of which Dr. Finsch most justly regretted in 1868, is only supplied in 1873, and then in 1874 flung in his teeth for having wished for it.

Further notice of Mr. Hume's criticisms in connexion with this species might be omitted did they not comprise the following gross personal insult to Dr. Finsch:—"Orange yellow wing-spot birds are common enough, and if he will pay the postage and *return* the specimen, I will send him one to look at" (*t. c.* p. 17). To the word "*return*," printed in

italics, is appended this footnote, with which, I much regret, I must soil these pages by transcribing:—"This is not a matter of course, because a naturalist who begins by appropriating his neighbour's species, *may* end by annexing their specimens. As Dr. Finsch would doubtless say '*Facile* descensus, etc.!*'"

Having delivered himself of this magnanimous sentiment, with its playful insinuation of a felonious tendency in Dr. Finsch, a passage which will only escape the indignant reprobation of all high-minded men, when it escapes observation, Mr. Hume proceeds to discuss Dr. Finsch's treatment of *Palæornis schisticeps*, Hodgson. After another offensive personality, a wretched joke about "his sensitive classical nerves!" Mr. Hume quotes and criticises thus:—"According to Blyth' (and he might have added Hodgson who described the bird, Jerdon, and a dozen others), 'the females are only distinguished by the absence of the red-brown wing spot.' Blyth of course being *no* authority any more than other Indian ornithologists, Dr. Finsch continues, 'I am much more inclined to conclude that the red-brown spot would appear also in the full plumaged female,' in other words he through his supreme wisdom without having examined a single bird in the flesh, is intuitively better acquainted with the state of the case than skilled practical naturalists who have dissected scores" (*t. c.* pp. 17, 18). Then comes in, as a *Deus ex machinâ*, the great, frequent dictatorial Ego†, with ponderous yet impotent effect. "Let me tell Dr. Finsch, that I personally must have sexed some thirty specimens of this species, and that the following is my experience" (*l. c.*). Of the "experience" which follows, not having been published when Dr. Finsch wrote, it is unnecessary to give more than the first sentence, "The female *always* wants the deep maroon red

* What Dr. Finsch would "doubtless" have said, had he been quoting Virgil, is given in the *errata*.

† It may be here mentioned, as a matter of dry statistical detail, that apart from copious extracts from Dr. Finsch and Captain Hutton, and besides a host of "me's" "we's" "my's" and "us's," the first personal pronoun "I" occurs in the twenty-eight pages of this review at least one hundred and sixty-six times.

wing-spot," because it relates to the point in dispute and does not strictly accord with either Jerdon or Blyth's account. Jerdon says "a marone wing-spot in the male, barely indicated in the female" (B. Ind. i. p. 261); Blyth, "The adult sexes differ in the male having a small maronne spot on the wing, which is wanting or barely indicated in the female" (J.A.S.B. 1850, p. 232). So that even according to both Jerdon and Blyth the small maroon wing-spot of the male, though barely indicated, does "appear" in the female. But Dr. Finsch must be judged by what he, through a diligent and conscientious study of their published writings, had gathered that his authors personally knew, and not by what Mr. Hume, in more than exaggerated terms, says they did know. And although the fact may surprise my readers, in the face of Mr. Hume's audacious assertions just quoted, it is a fact that neither Jerdon, when he wrote the first volume of the '*Birds of India,*' nor Blyth were well acquainted with this species. Nor is there up to 1868 a tittle of published proof that any "skilled practical naturalist" had dissected a single specimen of this species, much less "scores." Jerdon writes (*t.c.* p. 261) "rare in the south-east, for I never saw it myself, and got but one young specimen while at Darjeeling;" and what Jerdon relates about the species is derived from Tytler and Adams, both of whom have no remarks on the diversity of the sexes or about the plumage. Jerdon only became well acquainted with the bird when, subsequently to the publication of the first volume of his book, he visited the north-western Himalayas, where it is abundant. Blyth's acquaintance was not more extensive. It is almost certain that he had never seen the wild bird; for he had not been in the regions it inhabits. He probably may have seen caged specimens occasionally at Calcutta; but he says that captured specimens are seldom brought to that town (*Ibis*, 1863, p. 4). Who the "dozen others" are previous to 1868, I confess my total inability to even offer a conjecture; and possessing a fair acquaintance with Indian ornithological literature myself, I cannot blame Dr. Finsch for not knowing either.

A slight mistake in degree Dr. Finsch has committed, con-

cerning the range of *P. schisticeps*, his impartial critic is "compelled to point out" (*t. c.* p. 18). Dr. Finsch states in general terms that it is found "in" (not "throughout," as Mr. Hume or his translator of German erroneously renders "im grössten Theile") "the greatest part of the Indian continent;" but he correctly enough gives in detail the range as known at the time he wrote. Its range is enormous; for it extends from Cashmere (Griffiths is said to have observed it at Pushut), along the lower ridges of the Himalayas as far ^{as} Eastern ~~as~~ Assam, and from Assam down to Pegu. Still, by some, Dr. Finsch's general statement might hypercritically be termed erroneous.

Now follows *Palæornis calthropæ*, Layard; and the facts connected with its history up to 1868 are few and simple. Few, because previous to the publishing date of Dr. Finsch's work only two naturalists had written about the species, namely Blyth and Layard. Blyth's part was confined to the description, on behalf of Layard, of two skins sent by Layard to Calcutta (*J. A. S. B.* 1849, p. 800). One of these, with "upper mandible bright coral, with a white tip; the lower reddish," Blyth determined to be a male; the other, with "both the mandibles dull coral with white tips," he characterized as belonging to a female or young male. Later (*op. c.* 1850, p. 234) mention is made by him of the receipt of three more specimens; but not one word is said about the characters whereby the sexes are distinguished, nor are they even described; and I cannot find a passage in any of Blyth's writings previous to 1868 where he defines the distinctions; and I believe this is all Blyth wrote or knew about this purely Ceylon species up to that date. Layard, in his "Notes on the Ornithology of Ceylon" (*Ann. N. H.* (2) xiii. p. 263, no. 177), omitted all description of the bird, and merely gave an account of its habits. He said nothing whatever about the colouring of the sexes. This author never published previous to 1868 in any scientific work or elsewhere another word about *P. calthropæ*. Nor does Dr. Finsch appear to have been more successful in his search for information, and he is most particular throughout his admirable and exhaustive work in giving all refer-

ences bearing on his subject. Kelaart, who, besides Layard, was the only ornithological author who may have seen *P. calthropæ* in "the flesh," merely includes its bare title in his list (Prodr. Faun. Zeylan. pp. xxx, 127). This embraces the sum total of the published facts regarding *P. calthropæ* up to 1868. And it was not until 1872 that it was made known that the female differed by having a black bill* (Holdsworth, P. Z. S. 1872, p. 426, no. 65). Mr. Hume knows this species by its skin only. Let me transcribe his remarks:—"When we turn to *calthropæ*, Layard, it is the same story; on no evidence, but his own personal conviction, on the contrary in the face of all existing evidence, Dr. Finsch calmly says: 'Questions in regard to differences in the adult plumage, and to whether the male and female are always differently coloured, still lack in this species an altogether more rigorous investigation. The numerous phases of plumage which I have seen, permit me to assert with tolerable certainty an entire similarity in both sexes. Noteworthy and wonderful however, always remains the black colour of the bill in the younger birds.' But as a matter of fact, no further investigation is required, because a dozen different observers have cleared up the main point at issue *viz.*, the colour of the adult female's bill, but our author absolutely ignores all this because it is irreconcilable with his theory! Unlike the other species with which I have previously dealt, I have never myself shot or dissected examples of *calthropæ*, but I have more faith in human testimony than our author apparently has, and having a large series of specimens carefully sexed by three different European observers, I can state the following with 'tolerable certainty' independently of what far better naturalists than myself have already recorded to a similar effect" (*t. c.* pp. 18, 19). I have given all the published facts within the possibility of Dr. Finsch's knowledge in 1868, and Mr.

* Mr. Holdsworth, as he obligingly has told me *in epist.*, did not arrive at this conclusion through having dissected a single specimen, but was guided by the experience of Mr. Bligh, who had killed many examples. It is just possible that Dr. Templeton may have published remarks on this species, but I have never seen any.

Hume's observations on Dr. Finsch's account of this species. Mr. Hume carefully abstains from stating the name of a single observer with whose investigations Dr. Finsch ought to have been acquainted, and "in the face of whose evidence" Dr. Finsch "flies." Nor does he dare to name one of the "dozen different observers" whom "our author absolutely ignores," nor of the "naturalists" who "have already recorded to a similar effect." Since Layard and Kelaart, that is since 1868, the only Ceylon naturalists who have written in any accessible, even if any, scientific journal on Ceylon ornithology are Holdsworth, Vincent Legge, and Hugh Nevill; and the first is the only one who has touched on the point at issue, and then only in 1872.

The next Indian species known to Mr. Hume, *Palæornis melanorhynchus*, Wagler, was divided by Dr. Finsch, guided by the evidence existing in 1868 (Papag. ii. pp. 66, 70), into two species—*P. lathamii*, Finsch, with the maxilla red in both sexes, and *P. melanorhynchus*, Wagler, with the bill, in both sexes, black. Subsequent investigations have led to the conclusion that these are sexual differences, and that only the adult male possesses a red maxilla, while the young birds and adult females possess black bills (*conf.* Walden, *Ibis*, 1873, p. 297, no. 2). For his conclusion, erroneous though it may now prove to be, Dr. Finsch is assailed with a volley of silly invective. Let, then, the facts before Dr. Finsch the facts recorded up to 1868, be examined. In the first place both Jerdon and Blyth confounded, by erroneous identification, the Indian bird and the Javan and Bornean *P. alexandri* (Birds of Ind. i. p. 263; *Ibis*, 1866, p. 353), and Dr. Finsch had therefore good grounds for being uncertain as to which of the two species they referred. Jerdon further described the bird as having "a large red* patch on the wing, formed by most of the lesser and some of the median coverts" (*l. c.*), which is not the case, as Dr. Finsch acutely remarks. Hodgson regarded the black-billed bird as belonging to a distinct species and named it *P. nigrirostris* (Gray, *Zool. Misc.* p. 85, 1844), and in the 'Calcutta Journal of Natural History'

* I suspect that the word "red" is a slip of the pen for yellow.

for 1847 (p. 560) its specific validity, its claim to rank as distinct from the red-billed birds, is maintained. Mr. Blyth (J. A. S. B. 1846, p. 24, note) stated, "in *P. pondicerianus*, the upper mandible of the female is usually black, but often more or less mingled with red; that of the male being always bright coral-red." Writing in 1850 (*op. cit.* xix. p. 234) the same author states of this bird, "In a presumed female observed in captivity, the upper mandible changed from black to coral-red when the bird was about 18 months old." Later on (Ibis, 1866, pp. 353, 354), the last time Mr. Blyth wrote on the species, he says, "From an early age (before leaving the nest) the sexes differ in the male having the upper mandible coral-red*, while that of the female is black . . . and in many females it perhaps remains permanently black, while in others it changes sooner or later to red." And he adds that he is "tolerably well acquainted with it, having spent a month in forests" with the species. Jerdon (*op. cit.* p. 263) describes the female in these words, "The female merely differs from the male by having a black bill at first, which changes to red in old or fully adult females." In the face of these conflicting opinions, is Dr. Finsch to be blamed for adopting an opinion of his own? and anyhow ought he to have been exposed to the insolent and insulting criticism which Mr. Hume, in relation to this species, heaps upon him? "(poor Jerdon and Blyth, always wrong! Finsch, the clever fellow, *always* right!!)" and then this observation on a remark of Dr. Finsch, "He adds with that deliciously bland assumption of superiority and omniscience which irradiates his pages" (*t. c.* p. 20). I will quote Dr. Finsch's opening words, "Ohne der Auctorität eines Blyth oder Jerdon zu nahe treten zu wollen" (*t. c.* p. 68). As to Jerdon's opinion on the moot point, it may be stated that up to the last he had not arrived at any decided conclusion. So uncertain was he, that by his advice, and in order to settle the question, a friend in Burma was written to and asked to collect and carefully mark the sex of as many specimens as he

* This is in direct opposition to what Mr. Hume lays down in the passage beginning "I too, who have seen thousands, and shot hundreds" (*t. c.* p. 20).

could obtain. And it may here be added that Jerdon felt and often expressed the highest admiration for Dr. Finsch's work on the *Psittacidae* and respect for its author.

"*Columboides*, Jerdon*, disguised under Dr. Finsch's new name *peristerodes*, is the next species" (*t. c.* p. 21). That the specific title *columboides* was not bestowed by Jerdon is probably known to every ornithologist in India, except Mr. Hume; for both in his "Illustrations," where this Parrakeet was figured, and in his general work, Jerdon, with his accustomed accuracy, attributed the title to the first describer of the species. The species was first named by the late Mr. Vigers, a cabinet naturalist, so far as Malabar birds were concerned. And to it Mr. Hume holds a similar position, for he has never seen it "in the flesh." Hence the personal knowledge he has acquired during the five years that have elapsed since Dr. Finsch's work was published cannot be flaunted before the enchanted gaze of credulous disciples nor hurled at the unoffending head of Dr. Finsch. Still faults, however microscopic, must be found. "Really the wonders disclosed by this work pass human comprehension! Dr. Finsch records an adult male, from the Himalayas, in the Leyden Museum, and an adult *female*, *precisely similar*, to the male, also from the Himalayas!! in Heine's Museum. What *Himalayan* female *columboides* may be like, no mere Indian ornithologist could presume to say. We leave that to Dr. Finsch" (*l. c.*), and so on *more suo*. From this disingenuous passage the trusting reader would gather that Dr. Finsch had stated that *P. columboides* occurred in the Himalayas. He has done nothing of the kind. He has merely, as is his habit all through the work, and as most accurate writers do, identified the specimen from which he made his diagnosis; in this fashion—"Himalaya (Leidener Museum). ♂ ad. Kopf, Rücken und, etc.; ♀ ad. (Himalaya) im Museum Heine, ganz wie das ♂ gefärbt" (*t. c.* pp. 74, 75). When we turn to the passage giving the full geographical distribution we find the complete range stated with a sufficient accuracy in

* *Sic*. This is not an accidental slip of the pen. At page 2, Mr. Hume writes "and Jerdon's *columboides*."

these words, "an der Malabarküste, bei Madras, im Decan, bei zum 17° nördlich, selten in den Neilgherries, bis auf Höhen von 5000'" (*t. c.* p. 76). The Himalayas are not included. But even here, notwithstanding Mr. Hume magniloquently has said that he has "not taken in hand to catalogue Dr. Finsch's errors" (*t. c.* p. 18), the little slip of the pen "bei Madras" is not overlooked. For, big as the beam is which intercepts the reviewer's critical vision, he is here able to espy this small mote in his brother naturalist's eye, and it is seized upon with all the charitable avidity compatible with "friendly relations." "Finsch tells us that this species is found in Madras; if he means the town or *district* of Madras (Chingleput) then he is certainly in error—if he means the *presidency* of Madras, then since the places he enumerates, the Malabar coast and the Nilghiris are both *in* this Presidency, it is, to say the least, surplusage, calculated to mislead;" and so on (*t. c.* p. 23). To an old Madrasee, one who has shot along with Jerdon many a specimen "in the flesh," to say nothing of Snipe in the paddy-fields of the Chingleput district, this phrase "*district* of Madras (Chingleput)" seems strange thunder. Madras was, and I believe is, a district by itself, with an area of some 30 square miles—bounded on the north by the Nellore district, to the west by the Arcot districts, and on the south by the Chingleput district, from which it is separated by the Adyar river. But this may be all changed, and the Madras and Chingleput districts may have been amalgamated*. If so, this local and parochial erudition in a high Bengal official is to be commended; but can it be reasonably expected from a European naturalist?

Of this species it may be also asserted that at the time Dr. Finsch wrote there was no published concurrent and convincing evidence on the moot point, the colouring of the bills in the two sexes. In the absence of adequate conclusive proof, Dr. Finsch maintained (*l. c.*), although with perfect deference to Dr. Jerdon, that the bills in the two sexes

* As a matter of fact I am informed *in epist.* by Sir Walter Elliot, the well-known and eminent Indian naturalist, that "Madras is certainly not included in Chingleput, but is a district by itself."

were coloured alike. I have frequently seen, and have shot, this species, and am inclined to think now, as I did then, that Jerdon's view is correct. Yet Sykes, an Indian ornithologist be it remembered, one who did not form his opinion from "half a dozen wrongly sexed skins in a museum," but from his own observations in the jungle, regarded the black-billed bird as specifically distinct from *P. columboides*, and bestowed on it a distinctive title, *P. melanorhynchus*. "Found in the ghauts. Sexes alike. This bird has the aspects of *Pal. columboides*, but differs in the black bill," etc. (Sykes, P. Z. S. 1832, p. 97). No other writer knew the species "in the flesh" previous to 1868. Mr. Blyth only knew it from a few "skins in a museum," and Dr. Finsch seems, in spite of Mr. Hume's remark, to make a fair observation when saying "Blyth is uncertain and says of the black-billed birds 'female or young'" (*l. c.*). But surely Dr. Finsch, even if shown by more recent investigation to have been in error, had and has a right to hold, advocate, and express an independent opinion, without being liable to insult in terms like these. "As usual, Dr. Finsch laments our ignorance in regard to all these species. It is really a pity that he will not be content to speak for himself. That *he* has still somewhat to learn is patent in every page, but the Indian ornithologists whose distinct statements he so unceremoniously ignores, puts aside, or directly contradicts, unfortunately for his reputation, are not quite so much "in tiefes* Dunkel" as himself" (*t. c.* p. 23). As I have shown, of the only three Indian ornithologists who had written, the first held one opinion, another the exact opposite, and the third, who only knew the species from a few museum skins, was uncertain. And yet Mr. Hume is a vindicator of truth. "It is not, however, for Dr. Finsch I write. Truth must be vindicated" (*t. c.* p. 26). Poor truth!

We now come to *P. erythrogeus*, Blyth. Dr. Finsch, in his account of the species, is, with an unaccustomed generosity, partly let off by Mr. Hume. For, in this instance, Dr. Finsch is not held responsible for not knowing in 1868 that the Andaman Parrakeet differed from the Nicobar *P. ery-*

* Corrected in the *errata*.

throgenys—a fact, if it be a fact, only acquired by Mr. Hume in 1873. Indeed Dr. Finsch went wrong in consequence of his adopting the published opinions of Jerdon and Blyth; yet for this confidence in their superior authority he receives no credit from Mr. Hume. Both Dr. Jerdon (B. of Ind. i. p. 264) and Mr. Blyth on several occasions (Mouat's Andaman, Append. p. 355; Ibis, 1863, p. 5) regarded the Nicobar and Andaman Parrakeets as belonging to one species. As elsewhere, so here, it is Mr. Hume, and not Dr. Finsch, who differs from Jerdon and Blyth; and he will therefore doubtless apply to himself the epithets he has so freely bestowed on our German friend, whenever guilty of a similar heresy. But, we fear, 'that in the Captain's but a cholerick word, which in the soldier is flat blasphemy.' Nor does Dr. Finsch receive complete absolution; for, relying on the descriptions of the specimens marked ♂ and ♀, obtained in the Nicobars by the 'Novara' scientific expedition, that of a female communicated to him by Herr v. Pelzel, Dr. Finsch suggested that Blyth's determination of a specimen with a black bill as a female (J. A. S. B. 1846, p. 23) was erroneous, and that he had described a young bird. "Unfortunately, for Dr. Finsch, it does nothing of the kind. Apud Finsch, Blyth is always wrong and Finsch is always right," etc. etc. "And in every single instance in which in regard to species of this genus, Dr. Finsch has questioned, disputed, or denied the correctness of Jerdon, Blyth, and other Indian ornithologists' statements, it is *he* and not *they* who have erred" (Str. Feath. t. c. p. 25). Well, is this a fact? and, with regard to this species, does Dr. Finsch contradict Jerdon, Blyth, and other Indian ornithologists? It has already been shown that by not contradicting Jerdon and Blyth on several important points Dr. Finsch is, according to Mr. Hume, wrong. Blyth, it must be remembered, only described his *P. erythro-*
genys from skins with sexes undetermined brought to him at Calcutta by Captain Lewis and the Rev. J. Barbe. Neither he nor Jerdon had "for a long series of years," not even for a single minute, "observed the free living birds, shot and dissected them," which, according to Mr. Hume, alone confers the right of stating an independent opinion. But

what does Colonel Tytler say in 1867? That gentleman resided for some time in the Andamans as governor. He was an accurate observer, and discovered and described many good species. He had all the qualifications insisted on by Mr. Hume as alone entitling a man to deference; for he was not only a field naturalist, but something far higher, an Indian field naturalist. Colonel Tytler described the Andaman Parrakeet, his *P. affinis*, thus—"generally like *P. erythrogenys*, the red cheek-mark and coloration of which it possesses, but differs constantly in having a black bill" (Ibis, 1867, p. 320). Beavan adds, on Colonel Tytler's authority, "*P. erythrogenys* he" (Colonel Tytler) "has seen in all stages, and it always has a red bill" (*l. c.*). Nor is this all; Dr. Finsch, as above stated, founded his opinion on Herr v. Pelzeln's description of a "sexed specimen" of a female in the Vienna Museum, obtained in the Nicobars "in the flesh" by the 'Novara' expedition. Three "sexed" as males, five "sexed" as females, and one specimen, with sex undetermined, came to the Vienna Museum. By what, then, was Dr. Finsch to be guided? Apart from Colonel Tytler's opinion, the conclusions of Mr. Blyth drawn from unmarked skins? or the statement of Herr v. Pelzeln, who had had the advantage of examining eight marked skins? Is it not allowable to assume that the zoologists attached to any European or American scientific expedition are capable of correctly determining by dissection the sexes of the specimens they obtain? But Mr. Hume readily disposes of this, I venture to submit, equitable argument in these words, "on the strength 'of an old female in the Vienna Museum' (palpably, to us who know the species, an old *male*)" etc. (*t. c.* p. 24). Unhappily Dr. Finsch, like most people, at least in Europe, not being gifted with a prophetic spirit, was unable to foretell in 1868 what "us who know the species" might know in 1874.

The same remarks will apply in the main to Mr. Hume's criticisms of the account given by Dr. Finsch of *Palæornis caniceps*, Blyth, the last of the nine good species of the genus within Mr. Hume's acquaintance. This handsome Parrakeet was likewise described from a single skin (much mutilated)

with a red maxilla, brought to Calcutta by Captain Lewis from the Nicobars. Mr. Blyth in this instance also never saw the bird "in the flesh," much less dissected it. Indeed the type specimen was so much mutilated that Blyth introduces his description with these words, "This is a very strongly marked species; but I can now merely indicate rather than describe it," etc. (J. A. S. B. 1846, p. 23, note). As in the case of *P. erythrogenys*, Blyth adopted the foregone conclusion, a mere theory unsupported by a single then existing established fact, that while the adult male had a red maxilla that of the female would be black. Shortly afterwards Mr. Blyth (*t. c.* p. 51, note) described, as belonging to the female of *P. caniceps*, a single skin from Province Wellesley, with a black maxilla, in Dr. Cantor's possession. These were the only examples of the species Blyth had seen previous to 1868. One, the type, remained in the Calcutta Museum; the other was given by Dr. Cantor to the E. I. C. Museum, and subsequently passed to the British Museum, where Dr. Finsch examined it. Besides these at least two examples were obtained in the Nicobars by the 'Novara' expedition, one of which, with a red maxilla, was proved by dissection to be a female (Reise Novara, Zool. i. p. 98). Herr v. Pelzeln (*l. c.*) distinctly states this, and adds, which is significant, for there was no controversy at the time, "therefore the colouring of the bill is the same in old individuals of both sexes." Dr. Cantor's single specimen and the specimens obtained by the 'Novara' were the only known examples existing in Europe when Dr. Finsch wrote; and all that was known about the species was restricted to the sources I have indicated. The question therefore again arises, By what was Dr. Finsch to be guided? The affirmative evidence of the 'Novara' zoologists, derived from actual examination of the *corpus*? or Mr. Blyth's opinion formed from a couple of dried skins? Regardless of possible dangers they had gone ashore, seen the bird alive, breathed with it the same air, shot and dissected it! Blyth only knew it, not even from "half a dozen wrongly sexed specimens in a museum," but from one, a much mutilated skin in a museum and a second good skin in private hands, but both with sexes undetermined

by dissection. The inconvenient fact stated by Herr v. Pelzeln of the Nicobar female having a red maxilla is thus disposed of by Dr. Finsch's friendly censor, now growing "weary of exposing these" (Dr. Finsch's) "perpetual and perverse blunders" (*t. c.* p. 25). This specimen, "allow me to inform our author, *was* unquestionably a male, and had been, dissection or no dissection, *wrongly* sexed! We shot and sexed 25 adults of this species . . . and we *know* beyond the possibility of a doubt, that Dr. Cantor and Blyth were perfectly correct," etc. etc. (*l. c.*). It is true that in a note quoted by Mr. Moore (P. Z. S. 1859, p. 454) Dr. Cantor states that the female has a black bill, and it was Mr. Blyth's foregone conclusion; for he says "the bill wholly black, as I suggested it would be in this sex" (*op. cit.* 1846, p. 51, note). But Dr. Cantor's opinion on an ornithological question could not be accepted as conclusive. An intimate friend of my own (many a friendly Manilla have we smoked together in Fort William), Dr. Cantor was no ornithologist. An excellent ichthyologist and herpetologist, he knew little, and professed to know nothing, about birds. What Mr. Hume was going to "*know* beyond the possibility of a doubt" in 1874 we again humbly submit, at the risk of being tedious, could not have been known to Dr. Finsch full five years before.

I have now shown that the major part of Mr. Hume's criticisms of Dr. Finsch's treatment of these eleven species of the genus *Palæornis* are in a less or greater degree mainly founded on perversions, misstatements, or misrepresentations of the established facts existing when Dr. Finsch was writing 'Die Papageien,' or else on trivial inaccuracies of expression. Also that in no single instance do Dr. Finsch's references to Jerdon, Blyth, or other Indian naturalists, when fairly interpreted, exhibit even a breath of discourtesy or absence of deference, consistent with freedom of judgment, to any opinion expressed, or facts narrated, by them. And although Dr. Finsch may, by the light of recent investigations, be shown to have arrived at some erroneous conclusions, they were mostly logical inferences to draw from the conflicting evidence on record at the time he wrote. Towards the close of his article

(*t. c.* p. 28) Mr. Hume has this passage, "I should ill fulfil my duty as editor of the sole Indian ornithological journal, if I did not rebuke, *sans façons*, his slighting treatment of the men to whom every Indian ornithologist owes so much." As an old Indian field ornithologist, as one of Dr. Jerdon's oldest friends, one in whom his memory lingers the most cherished of reminiscences, I protest against Mr. Hume's arrogating to himself the right to speak in the name of Indian ornithologists without better claim than the irresponsible editorship of a recent Indian ornithological periodical, or to exalt himself to the post of protector of Jerdon's, Blyth's, or any other Indian naturalist's reputation. The scientific works and deeds of those men are the common property of the scientific world, and not of a narrow Calcutta clique; and their memories are far safer from reproach under the guardianship of that great and increasing body of gifted, highly trained, and generous men, than if left to the patronizing care of a carping, indiscriminating, illiterate, and noxious advocacy. Mr. Hume is at liberty to "rebuke" whomsoever he pleases. His blame or his praise, at least his blame, will prove harmless. But Mr. Hume cannot evade the responsibilities of a reviewer. He cannot plead ignorance; for as a reviewer he is bound to bring to his task a reasonable amount of knowledge. Mr. Hume has most mercilessly attacked the scientific reputation of Dr. Finsch. I care not for the faint praise accorded to his minor merits. A reputation built up by many years of devoted and honourable labour in the cause of zoological science. A reputation as dear to him as our own is to any one of us, perhaps more so, perhaps his all. The coarse jokes or vulgar personalities, standing alone, might have passed unnoticed; for a coarse and vulgar style is some men's misfortune, and though exciting in supersensitive temperaments sensations of nausea, is submitted to by the philosophic mind with a shrug of the shoulder or a smile of resignation. But the unscrupulous reviewer of the hard conscientious work of a brother naturalist risks incurring that deserved odium which, by the common voice, attaches to the judgments of an unjust judge.